REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 11-21 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

The Prior Art Rejections

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action the Examiner has rejected all claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,745,110 to Ertemalp in view of newly cited U.S. Patent 5,513,342 to Leong et al.

The Prior Art

U.S. Patent 5,745,110 to Ertemalp is directed to a method and apparatus for arranging and displaying task schedule information in a calendar view format. For example, Figure 11, referenced by the Examiner, displays a calendar with task bars of varying size. However, the size of the task bars depends on the start and finish times for these tasks (see column 10, lines 35-52).

U.S. Patent 5,513,342 to Leong et al. is directed to a display window layout system that automatically accommodates changes in display resolution, font size and national language. Leong et al. is specifically directed to a class of windows that are referred to as "canvas" containers which hold subsidiary windows which are referred to as "child" windows. For example, Figure 3 illustrates a canvas window which includes a number of child windows 42, 44, 46 and 48. When the environment changes (e.g., a change in the font), the text may be clipped as illustrated in Figure 4. Figure 5 illustrates a set canvas window 50 produced by a procedure that automatically causes child windows to be resized to accommodate a changed font size (column 4, lines 22-40). Figure 7 illustrates a multi-cell canvas where child windows are positioned by specifying a row and column location for each cell. Leong et al. notes that not all cells need to be filled and that a child window is allowed to occupy multiple cells and to overlap other child windows. In connection with Figure 8, Leong et al. describes increasing the sizes of any row or column to accommodate any child window that spans multiple rows or multiple columns (column 5, lines 39-65).

The Present Claimed Invention Patentably Distinguishes Over the Prior Art

Claim 1

Referring, for example, to claim 1, in accordance with the present claimed invention, a layout control device forms a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining a layout. The layout is formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units. A display control device controls display of the schedule table according to the layout. The layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting the size of the rows or columns to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units.

In the Amendment filed in response to the prior Office Action, the applicant pointed out that in accordance with the present invention a layout control device forms a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining the layout. Further, the applicant urged that the layout is adjusted automatically based on quantities inside the plurality of display units. The applicants submitted that none of the prior art taught or suggested adjusting the layout automatically based on quantities inside the plurality of display units.

On pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action the Examiner responds to applicant's prior arguments. However, the Examiner's comments are not directed to the argument that the claims distinguished over the prior art because the layout is adjusted automatically based on quantities inside the plurality of display units. Therefore, it is believed that the Examiner is relying on the new rejection of the claims as unpatentable over Ertemalp in view Leong et al. In particular, at the top of page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Ertemalp does not disclose the feature wherein the layout is adjusted automatically based on quantities inside the plurality of display units. The Examiner now takes the following position:

> Leong et al. teaches the method of automatically adjusting window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes (column 2, lines 32-45).

(See page 3 of the Office Action.)

The portion of Leong et al. relied on by the Examiner describes automatically adjusting window size and positioning in accordance with window environment changes such as changes in user readable data or window resolution. Thus, Leong et al. does not specifically relate to a layout control device which forms a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns, and Leong et al. does not suggest automatically adjusting the layout based on quantities inside

a plurality of display units. While column 5, lines 39-65 of Leong et al. discusses the concept of rows and columns with reference to Figures 7 and 8 of Leong et al., there is clearly no teaching relating to a schedule table comprising rows and columns as set forth in the present claimed invention. In particular, Figure 7 clearly does not show any type of row/column arrangement.

In summary, it is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest:

> a layout control device forming a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining the layout, the layout formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units; and...
>
> wherein the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows or columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

On page 3 of the Office Action the Examiner takes the position that one of skill would have been led to combine the features of Ertemalp and Leong "with the motivation of being to display in each column or row with the largest number of items and/or schedule requiring the largest display area as taught by Leong et al."

It is submitted that one of ordinary skill would not have been led by teachings relating to canvas windows and child windows presented in Leong et al. to modify the task schedule information presented in a calendar view format disclosed by Ertemalp. It is submitted that there is nothing in the prior art which would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art that this modification should have been made to the Ertemalp teaching. Therefore, for this reasons also, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 3 and 4

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 3 and 4 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 5

Referring to claim 5, it is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed schedule display control method which comprises:

> controlling a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining the layout, the layout formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units; and
>
> ... wherein the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows or columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units.

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claims 7 and 8

Claims 7 and 8 depend from claim 5 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 7 and 8 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 9

Referring to claim 9, it is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed computer readable storage medium which performs the process of:

> controlling a layout of a schedule table comprising rows and columns defining the layout, the layout formed based on a schedule quantity inside a plurality of display units; and...
>
> wherein the layout control device forms the layout by automatically adjusting a size of the rows or columns based on the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units to accommodate the schedule quantity inside the plurality of display units.

Therefore it is submitted that claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claims 11 and 12

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 9 and include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 11 and 12 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 13

Referring to claim 13, it is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed schedule display control device which comprises:

> a layout device dividing a calendar period into a plurality of display units displaying information, said display units formed in rows, and automatically adjusting a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row displaying a largest size of information inside the display unit based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; and
>
> a display device displaying the display units with their corresponding information inside.

Therefore it is submitted that claim 13 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 14

Referring to claim 14, it is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed schedule display control device which comprises:

> a layout device dividing a calendar period into a plurality of display units displaying information, said display units formed in columns, and automatically adjusting a width of the display units of each column to match the display unit in a respective column displaying a largest size of information inside the display unit based on the largest size of information inside the display unit;

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claim 15

Referring to claim 15, it is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed schedule display device which comprises:

> ...said layout device automatically adjusts a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row displaying a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit;
>
> said layout device automatically adjusts a width of the display units of each column to match the display unit in a respective column displaying a largest size of information, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; and...

Therefore, it is submitted that claim 15 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Claims 16-21

It is submitted that the prior art does not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 16-21 which are identified below:

> automatically adjusting a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row displaying a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; (claim 16)
>
> automatically adjusting a width of the display units of each column to match the display unit in a respective column displaying a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; (claim 17)
>
> automatically adjusting a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row containing a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit;

automatically adjusting a width of the display units of each column to match the display unit in a respective column containing a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; (claim 18)

automatically adjusting a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row containing a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; and (claim 19)

automatically adjusting a width of the display units of each column to match the display unit in a respective column containing a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; (claim 20)

automatically adjusting a length of the display units of each row to match the display unit in a respective row containing a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit;
automatically adjusting a width of the display units of each column to match the display unit in a respective column containing a largest size of information inside the display unit, based on the largest size of information inside the display unit; (claim 21)

Therefore, it is submitted that claims 16-21 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Summary

It s submitted that none of the references, either taken alone or in combination, teach the present claimed invention. Thus, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9 and 11-21 are deemed to be in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and early notice of allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 2-12-04

By: _____
John C. Garvey
Registration No. 28,607

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501